

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 2, and 5 are amended. No new matter is added. Claims 1-7 are pending and under consideration.

INTERVIEW REQUEST

Applicant's representative called the Examiner on December 20 to schedule a personal interview prior to filing a response to the Office Action. Since the interview could not be scheduled prior to the (one-month extended) due date, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to allow updating the content of this amendment via a supplemental amendment, if necessary, in view of the interview.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0188499 to Jenkins et al (hereinafter "Jenkins").

Relative to independent claim 1, Jenkins does not anticipate "performing selectively one of a supply-demand planning per order and a supply-demand planning based on total amount of orders, depending upon switching information stored in correspondence to a base and an item in a table," because:

- A. "data contained in a column" of Jenkins is not the same as the recited switching information, and
- B. aggregation forecast or inventory is not the same as the supply-demand planning per order or the supply-demand planning based on total amount of orders.

A. On page 3 lines 2-5, the outstanding Office Action asserts that the features recited in claim 1, "depending upon switching information stored in correspondence to a base and an item in a table" is anticipated by Jenkins because "depending on the source data, as seen in the source column, table 2, the system uses one of two styles of aggregation forecast or inventory, ¶¶ 0083-0084." Table 2 includes the following columns: item, source, destination (Dest.), effective (i.e. a date), and factor. Paragraph [0084] of Jenkins asserts "Depending on the data contained in a column, the system uses one of two styles of aggregation forecast or inventory." This statement is vague and does not point out to the source column. Further, in paragraphs [0085] and [0086], Jenkins asserts "The system uses forecast aggregation in situations where data represents information at a particular point in time" and "Alternatively, the system uses

inventory style aggregation where the data represents information as of the beginning or ending point of each period...". Thus, the content of the source column is not the determinative factor regarding the style of aggregation used, and thus it does not teach or suggest the recited switching information.

B. At the bottom of page 2 and first two lines on page 3, the outstanding Office Action takes the position that the supply-demand planning per order and on total amount of orders respectively are anticipated by Jenkins' disclosure in paragraph [0048] as "to cover demand that occurs" and "any demand that occurs within a period is aggregated together and met with a single planned order," respectively. This position is inconsistent with to the following assertions relative to the alleged switching information yielding a selection between aggregation forecast or inventory. The Office Action indicates as corresponding to the supply-demand planning per order and on total amount of orders, respectively, four different categories among which any logical connection is missing. In fact, none of the indicated categories anticipate the supply-demand planning per order and on total amount of orders, respectively.

Therefore since Jenkins does not anticipate all the features recited in claim 1, claim 1 and claim 2 depending from claim 1 are patentable over the cited prior art.

Independent claim 3, patentably distinguishes over Jenkins at least because Jenkins fails to anticipate "a table containing switching information corresponding to a base and an item" and "performing selectively, depending upon the switching information, a supply-demand planning per order or a supply-demand planning based on total amount of orders."

Independent claim 4 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art at least by reciting "fetching switching information corresponding to a base and an item from a table, which contains the switching information corresponding to the base and the item" and "performing selectively, depending upon the switching information, a supply-demand planning per order a supply-demand planning based on total amount of orders." Applicant respectfully submits that the outstanding Office Action fails to give full consideration to all the features recited in claim 4. In particular, the recited "fetching switching information corresponding to a base and an item from a table, which contains the switching information corresponding to the base and the item" is not considered. Applicant respectfully submits that Jenkins does not anticipate a table with switching information corresponding to a base and an item.

Independent claim 5 is amended herewith to further recite that the "making includes maintaining a stock above a safety stock when manufacturing-driven planning is performed." The added feature is fully supported by the originally filed specification, for example, page 12,

lines 5-6. The added feature, and “making the supply-demand planning for the whole supply chain by selectively using the procurement-driven planning or the manufacturing-driven planning based on switching information that is managed associated with a combination of a base and an item” as recited in claim 5 are not anticipated by Jenkins, rendering claim 5 patentable over the cited prior art.

Independent claim 6 and claim 7 depending upon claim 6 patentably distinguish over Jenkins at least because Jenking does not anticipate “a table of orders, each order relating to an item and an entity storing or producing the item within a supply chain, the order including switching information related to either a procurement-driven supply-demand planning or a manufacturing-driven supply-demand planning” as recited in claim 6. On page 5, lines 6-8, the outstanding Office Action asserts that “a sourcing table in database 600, wherein the planning component 210 determines a level for each SKU, including destinations and sources that replenish SKU, ¶0039” corresponds to the above recitation of claim 6. However, none of the level of SKU (which is an acronym for “stock keeping unit”), destinations or sources is switching information.

Moreover, relative to independent claim 6, Jenkins also fails to anticipate “a planning unit that generates a supply-demand plan according to the procurement-driven supply-demand planning or the manufacturing-driven supply-demand planning associated with the switching information.”

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/671,595

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Dec. 26, 2007

By: L Todor
Luminita Todor
Registration No. 56,639

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501